



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,237	03/19/2004	Yonghua Song	MP0031RE	6605
26703 7590 01/09/2009 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE P.L.C. 5445 CORPORATE DRIVE SUITE 200 TROY, MI 48098				
EXAMINER				
TRA, ANH QUAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2816				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/804,237
Filing Date: March 19, 2004
Appellant(s): SONG, YONGHUA

Michael D. Wiggins
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 10/24/08 appealing from the Office action mailed 04/17/08.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

No evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Oath/Declaration

1. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to identify at least one error which is relied upon to support the reissue application. See 37 CFR 1.175(a)(1) and MPEP § 1414.

2. Claims 1-45, 47-56, 58-68 and 70-72 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue Oath under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the Oath is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant has not clearly stated that anything that is listed in the declaration is an error. Instead, Appellant just uses the term "potential ambiguity". As indicated in MPEP 1402, if the error is one of spelling, or grammar, or typographical, editorial or clerical error, it is not grounds for a reissue application. If the "error" can be corrected via Certificate of Correction, it cannot be used as the basis of a reissue application. All the potential ambiguities listed by appellant in the declaration is editorial in nature and correctable via Certificate of Correction. Appellant should clearly and specifically state at least one clear error which makes the patent wholly or partly inoperative or invalid. See MPEP section 1414(II)(C). Under MPEP section 1414(II)(B), it is sufficient when identifying the error, that the declaration "identify" a single word, phrase, or expression in the specification or in an original claim, as long as it indicates how this error renders the original patent "wholly or partly inoperative or invalid."

As cited by appellant, In re Altenphohl, 500 F.2d 1151, held that lack of antecedent basis **can** render a claim invalid under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph and thus be an error correctable via reissue. However, lack of antecedent basis does not automatically render a claim invalid under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. In most cases, a 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejection would not be given for a mere lack of antecedent basis. The decision whether the lack of antecedent basis would render a claim invalid under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph is a decision for the Director (i.e., examiner) to make and not the appellant. All the potential ambiguities listed by appellant in the declaration appear to be editorial in nature and correctable via Certificate of Correction. Therefore, they cannot be used as the basis of a reissue application.

Art Unit: 2816

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

(12) Conclusion

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Conferees:

Edward Westin
/Edward Westin/
Quality Assurance Specialist, TC 2800

Lincoln Donovan
/Donovan Lincoln/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2816

Quan Tra
/QUAN TRA/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2816